

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-15, 20, 22, 23, and 25-35 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In a Final Office Action dated March 8, 2007, all pending claims were rejected.

By way of this reply, claims 1, 13, 25, and 27 have been amended, claims 6, 12, 30, and 31 have been cancelled. Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicant thanks Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Warren and Kobayashi

In the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1, 5, 7-9, 12-15, 20, 22, 23, and 25-35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,999,792 (“Warren”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,633,759 (“Kobayashi”).

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, the following:

A peripheral device for operation in conjunction with a handheld wireless communication device, the peripheral device comprising:

...

a communication interface operable to automatically establish connectivity with the handheld wireless communication device in response to a transition of the enclosure from the closed position to the opened position, to receive first data and software code for a peripheral application from the handheld wireless communication device, and to transmit second data to the handheld wireless communication device, the first and second data being interactable by an application on the handheld wireless communication device, the peripheral application being associated with the application on the handheld wireless communication device;

...

a processor, coupled to the alphanumeric keyboard, the enclosure, the communication interface, and the screen, operable to execute the software code for the peripheral application using the user input

data and the first data thereby generating the second data.
(emphasis added)

As amended, independent claim 1 beneficially recites a peripheral device operational with a handheld wireless communication device (e.g., a smartphone or personal digital assistant with wireless network functionality) that can automatically establish connectivity with the handheld device in response to a transition of an enclosure from a close position to an open position. The peripheral device can also receive “first data and software code for a peripheral application” from the handheld device and execute the received software code using the first data to generate second data.

The claimed feature of receiving software code for software applications from the handheld computing system enables the peripheral device to execute software applications not previously installed in the peripheral device. Therefore, the user can use the peripheral device to complete working on matters that began on the handheld computing system. For example, the user can start typing an email using email software on a handheld wireless communication device, and subsequently transmit the unfinished data (e.g. the initial email) and its associated software code (e.g., code for completing the email) for that application to the peripheral device. The user can then finish the email using that peripheral application on the peripheral device and transmit the completed data (e.g., the finished email) back to the handheld wireless communication device. Advantageously, users of the peripheral device are not restricted to the software applications previously resided on the peripheral device and can transfer software code for the desired software applications from the handheld wireless communication device to the peripheral device.

The cited references, Warren and Kobayashi, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the claimed features emphasized above. In the Office Action, Examiner correctly

indicated that neither Warren nor Kobayashi teaches the claimed feature of “automatically establish connectivity with the handheld wireless communication device in response to a transition of the enclosure from the closed position to the opened position.” See Office Action, page 11. Examiner also correctly noted that Warren does not teach a peripheral device receiving data and software code for a peripheral application from a handheld device and executing the received software code using the data. See Office Action, p. 4.

Kobayashi similarly fails to disclose these claimed features. Kobayashi discloses a system and method for a user to start a software in a remote device using a local device and display the display data generated by the software on the local device. See, e.g., Kobayashi, col. 2, lines 14-21. Thus, Kobayashi only teaches about using the local device to control the remote device and displaying the display data of the remote device in the local device.

Kobayashi fails to disclose receiving “first data and software code for a peripheral application” from the handheld device and executing the received software code using the first data to generate second data. Examiner points to col. 4, lines 33-38, col. 5, lines 3-14, col. 8, lines 32-42, col. 9, lines 5-12, col. 12, lines 22-32, and col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 6 of Kobayashi for teaching of these claimed features. However, these cited sections fail to suggest or hint a peripheral device receiving data and software code for a peripheral application from a handheld device and executing the received software code using the data. Col. 4, lines 33-38 of Kobayashi merely identifies examples of software of which associated data can be sent to another device (a PC or a cellular phone) for display. See Kobayashi, col. 27-37. In Kobayashi, the associated data being transferred are display data, not software code ready for a peripheral device to execute. See Kobayashi, col. 12, lines 22-32. Col. 5, lines 3-14 merely discloses that the PC and the cellular phone both furnish a

communication function. Col. 8, lines 32-42 and col. 9, lines 5-12 merely describe a mechanism for the PC and the cellular phone to establish and release a wireless link. Col. 12, lines 22-32 merely describes a mechanism for a user to use the PC to make a key manipulation input in the cellular phone, and display on the PC's screen a display on the cellular phone's screen. The data being transmitted between the PC and the cellular phone are the key manipulation and display data, not software code ready for a peripheral device to execute. Col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 6 merely describes an example of a user using the PC as a viewer of the cellular phone. In the example, the user uses the PC to remotely start an e-mail function of the cellular phone on the cellular phone and "confirms the mail data obtained by the e-mail function by displaying the same on the screen of the PC." Therefore, similar to the disclosure of col. 12, lines 22-32, the data being transferred between the PC and the cellular phone are merely key manipulations and display data, not software code ready for a peripheral device to execute, as claimed in the independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Warren and Kobayashi, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Warren and Kobayashi. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 25 as amended recites, inter alia, the following:

A peripheral device for a handheld computing system, the peripheral device comprising:

a communication interface structured to receive first data and software code for a peripheral application from the handheld computing system and transmit second data to the handheld

computing system, wherein the first data and the second data are interactable by a handheld application on the handheld computing system, the peripheral application being associated with the handheld application;

...

a processor coupled to the communication interface, the backup memory, the alphanumeric keyboard, and the display and **configured to execute the software code for the peripheral application using the user input and the first data thereby generating the second data.** (emphasis added)

As amended, independent claim 25 benefitially recites a peripheral device for a handheld computing system that can “receive first data and software code for a peripheral application from the handheld computing system” and execute the received software code using the first data to generate second data. As argued above with regard to independent claim 1, Warren and Kobayashi, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose this claimed feature.

In view of the above, Warren and Kobayashi, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 25. Thus, independent claim 25 is patentable over Warren and Kobayashi. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Warren, Kobayashi, and

Guerlin

In the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 4 and 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Warren and Kobayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,680 (“Guerlin”).

The arguments set forth with respect to independent claim 1 establish that Warren and Kobayashi, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose a peripheral device that can automatically establish connectivity with the handheld device in response to a transition of an enclosure from a close position to an open position and receive “first data and software code for a peripheral application” from the handheld device and execute the received software code using the first data to generate second data, as claimed in independent claim 1. These arguments are applicable for dependent claims 4 and 6, and are incorporated by reference.

Guerlin also fails to disclose these claimed elements. In contrast to the claimed invention, Guerlin discloses “a method and apparatus for conserving energy in a system including two devices interconnected by a data communication link.” (See Guerlin, abstract, col. 3, lines 59-62). Guerlin conserves energy consumption by putting the two devices in standby mode during periods when the two devices are inactive. (See Guerlin, col. 5, line 55 – col. 7, line 48). In order to put one device into standby mode or reactivate the device from standby mode, the other device sends or ceases to send messages to the device. (See Guerlin, col. 7, lines 9-43).

Guerlin fails to disclose the claimed element of receiving “first data and software code for a peripheral application” from the handheld device and executing the received software code using the first data to generate second data. The data transmitted between the two devices are command signals to be processed by applications in the devices, not software code for software applications executable in a peripheral device.

Guerlin also fails to disclose the claimed element of automatically establishing connectivity with the handheld device in response to a transition of an enclosure from a close

position to an open position. Examiner points to col. 6, lines 17-28 and col. 7, lines 1-8 of Guerlin for teaching of this claimed feature. However, these cited sections merely disclose the following mechanism for a mobile telephone to determine whether to place a microcomputer on standby to conserve energy consumption by the microcomputer. The mobile telephone periodically transmits scanning messages to and receives response messages from the microcomputer. If the mobile telephone does not receive response messages for a number of consecutive scanning messages, it decides to put the microcomputer on standby. This disclosure in Guerlin is not what Applicant claims. The microcomputer fails to respond to scanning messages is different from a transition of an enclosure from a close position to an open position. The mobile telephone putting the microcomputer on standby is also different from automatically establishing connectivity between the peripheral device and the handheld wireless communication device.

In view of the above, Warren, Kobayashi, and Guerlin, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Warren, Kobayashi, and Guerlin. Dependent claims 4 and 6 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 13-15, 20, 22, 23, 25-30, and 32-35, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and requests allowance of them.

Should Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments or if Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicant's representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jeffrey C. Hawkins

Date: June 8, 2007

By: /Jie Zhang/

Jie Zhang, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 60,242
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200